

Multivariable codes over finite chain rings: semisimple codes

E. MARTÍNEZ-MORO* I.F. RÚA†

February 1, 2008

Abstract

The structure of multivariate semisimple codes over a finite chain ring R is established using the structure of the residue field $\bar{R}$. Multivariate codes extend in a natural way the univariate cyclic and negacyclic codes and include some non-trivial codes over R . The structure of the dual codes in the semisimple abelian case is also derived and some conditions on the existence of selfdual codes over R are studied.

Keywords. finite chain ring, multivariate codes, semisimple codes

AMS Subject classification. 11T71, 13M10, 94B99

Submitted to: *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*.

1 Introduction

Many authors have stated that many classical codes are ideals in certain algebras over a finite field, see for example [1, 4, 15]. On the other hand, the theory of error-correcting codes over finite rings has gained a great relevance since the realization that some non-linear codes can be seen as linear codes over a finite ring (see for example [3, 6, 10, 11, 12]). This paper is a contribution to both lines pointed above and its purpose is to describe multivariate semisimple codes over a finite chain ring R . Through the paper a semisimple code over R will be an ideal of a particular type of R -algebras. We shall note that the name of semisimple codes arise from the fact that the image code in the residue ring $\bar{R}$ is semisimple (in fact they are not semisimple over R). The main tools used in the paper are Hensel's Lemma and the decomposition of the roots of the

*Departamento de Matemática Aplicada, Universidad de Valladolid, Spain, (edgar@maf.uva.es). Partially supported by MEC MTM2004-00876 and MTM2004-00958 I+D projects.

†Departamento de Matemáticas, Estadística y Computación Universidad de Cantabria, Spain, (i.f.rua@unican.es). Partially supported by MTM2004-08115-C04-01 I+D project.

defining ideal in cyclotomic classes. Multivariate codes extend in a natural way the univariate cyclic and negacyclic codes [5] and include some non-trivial codes over R .

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the basic results on finite chain rings needed. Section 3 is devoted to the definition of the codes and their ambient space as well as the description of their structure. In Section 4 we study the duals of abelian semisimple codes. Finally in Section 5 we characterize those non-trivial abelian semisimple codes that are self-dual.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we fix our notation and show some basic facts about finite chain rings (see for example [2, 9] for a complete account). From now on, by a ring R we will always mean an associative commutative ring with identity, unless explicitly stated. A ring R is called **local ring** if it has a unique maximal ideal and it is called a **chain ring** if the set of all the ideals is a chain under set-theoretical inclusion. It can be shown (see for example Proposition 2.1 in [5]) that R is a finite commutative chain ring if, and only if, R is a local ring and its maximal ideal M is principal. In this case let $a \in R$ be a fixed generator of the ideal $M = \text{rad}(R)$ and, since $a \in M$ is nilpotent, let t be its nilpotency index. Then we have

$$\langle 0 \rangle = \langle a^t \rangle \subsetneq \langle a^{t-1} \rangle \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \langle a^1 \rangle = M \subsetneq \langle a^0 \rangle = R. \quad (1)$$

Let $q = p^l$ where p is a prime and $\mathbb{F}_q = \bar{R} = R/M$ is the residue field of R . We can extend the natural ring homomorphism $r \mapsto \bar{r} = r + M$ as follows

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \hookrightarrow & R[X] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{F}_q & \hookrightarrow & \mathbb{F}_q[X] \end{array} \quad (2)$$

Two polynomials $f_1, f_2 \in R[X]$ are **coprime** if $(f_1, f_2) = 1$. A polynomial $f \in R[X]$ is called **regular** if it is not a zero divisor and **basic irreducible** if it is regular and $\bar{f} \in \mathbb{F}_q[X]$ is irreducible. The following well known result will be used several times in the paper, for a proof see for example [2, Theorem 3.2.6]

Theorem 1 (Hensel's lemma). *Let R be a finite local ring and $f \in R[X]$ be a monic polynomial such that $\bar{f} = g_1 g_2 \dots g_r$ where the polynomials $g_i \in \bar{R}[X]$ are monic and pairwise relative prime. Then there exist monic coprime polynomials $f_i \in R[X]$ $i = 1, \dots, r$ such that $\bar{f}_i = g_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $f = f_1 f_2 \dots f_r$. This decomposition is uniquely determined up to a permutation of the factors.*

From Hensel's lemma we can deduce the existence of polynomials **lifting** a factorization in $\bar{R}[X]$ to a factorization in $R[X]$. We refer to these polynomials as **lifting factors**.

Let R and S be two rings such that $R \subseteq S$, then we say that S is an **extension** of R . If $T \subseteq S$ and $T \neq \emptyset$ of finite cardinality, then the ring

generated by T is the smallest subring A containing $R \cup T$. If $T = \{a\}$ is a singleton, then we call the extension **simple** and denote it by $A = R(a)$. If R and S are two finite local rings with residue fields F and K respectively, such that $R \subseteq S$, then S is a **separable extension** of R if K is a separable extension of F in the sense of field extensions.

In our paper we consider monic polynomials $t_i(X_i) \in R[X_i]$ $i = 1, \dots, r$ such that $\bar{t}_i(X_i) \in K[X_i]$ is square-free, where K is the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{F}_q$ (semisimple case). So we have that

$$t_i(X_i) = \prod_{j=1}^{r_i} f_{i,j}(X_i) \quad (3)$$

where $f_{i,j}(X_i)$, $j = 1, \dots, r_i$ are monic basic irreducible polynomials and $(f_{i,j}, f_{i,k}) = 1$, if $j \neq k$. This decomposition is unique up to a relabelling of the factors due to Hensel's lemma.

3 Multivariable semisimple codes

In this section we will obtain the structure of a multivariable semisimple code over a finite chain ring R , i.e., we will describe explicitly the structure of the ideals of the ring $R[X_1, \dots, X_r] / \langle t_1(X_1), \dots, t_r(X_r) \rangle$. In order to obtain this description we will decompose this ring as a direct sum of finite local chain rings. This decomposition is based on the corresponding decomposition of the semisimple ring $\mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_r] / \langle \bar{t}_1(X_1), \dots, \bar{t}_r(X_r) \rangle$.

3.1 Descomposition of $R[X_1, \dots, X_r] / \langle t_1(X_1), \dots, t_r(X_r) \rangle$

Let

$$I = \langle t_1(X_1), \dots, t_r(X_r) \rangle \triangleleft R[X_1, \dots, X_r]$$

be the ideal generated by the polynomials $t_i(X_i)$ $i = 1, \dots, r$ defined as in the section above. Let H_i be the set of roots of $\bar{t}_i(X_i)$ in a suitable extension field of $\mathbb{F}_q$ for each $i = 1, \dots, r$ (notice that $\bar{t}_i(X_i)$ has no multiple roots).

Definition 1. Let $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r) \in H_1 \times \dots \times H_r$, then we define the **class** of μ as

$$C(\mu) = \left\{ (\mu_1^{q^s}, \dots, \mu_r^{q^s}) \mid s \in \mathbb{N} \right\}. \quad (4)$$

Proposition 1. Let $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r) \in H_1 \times \dots \times H_r$ and d_i be the degree of the minimal polynomial of μ_i over $\bar{R} = \mathbb{F}_q$ for each $i = 1, \dots, r$, then we have that

1. $|C(\mu)| = \text{l.c.m.}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_r) = [\mathbb{F}_q(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r) : \mathbb{F}_q]$.
2. The set of classes $C(\mu)$ is a partition of $H_1 \times \dots \times H_r$.
3. For each ideal $J \triangleleft \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_r] / \langle \bar{t}_1(X_1), \dots, \bar{t}_r(X_r) \rangle$ the affine variety $V(J)$ of common zeros of the elements in J is a union of classes.

Proof. See [16] for a proof. $\square$

Definition 2. Let us denote by $\text{Irr}(\alpha, \mathbb{F}_q)$ the minimal polynomial of $\alpha \in K$ over the field $\mathbb{F}_q$ (K is an algebraic extension of $\mathbb{F}_q$). If $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r) \in H_1 \times \dots \times H_r$, then we define the following polynomials:

1. $p_{\mu,i}(X_i) = \text{Irr}(\mu_i, \mathbb{F}_q)$, and $d_{\mu,i} = \deg p_{\mu,i}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, r$.
2. $w_{\mu,i}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{i-1}, X_i) = \text{Irr}(\mu_i, \mathbb{F}_q(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{i-1}))$ for all $i = 2, \dots, r$.
3. $\pi_{\mu,i}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{i-1}, X_i) = p_{\mu,i}(X_i)/w_{\mu,i}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{i-1}, X_i)$ for all $i = 2, \dots, r$.

Remark 1. All the polynomials in the definition above can be seen as polynomials in $\mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_r]$ (substituting μ_i by X_i) and clearly the following ring isomorphism holds

$$\mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_r] / \langle p_{\mu,1}, w_{\mu,2}, \dots, w_{\mu,r} \rangle \cong \mathbb{F}_q(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r). \quad (5)$$

Moreover, if $\mu' \in C(\mu)$, then $p_{\mu,i} = p_{\mu',i}$ $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $w_{\mu,i} = w_{\mu',i}$, $\pi_{\mu,i} = \pi_{\mu',i}$ $i = 2, \dots, r$.

If $q(X) \in R[X]$ is the Hensel's lifting of a monic irreducible polynomial $p(X) \in \mathbb{F}_q[X]$ and $M = \text{rad}(R)$, then $\langle M, q(X) \rangle$ is a maximal ideal of $R[X]$ and (cf. [2, Remark after Lemma 3.2.10])

$$R[X] / \langle M, q(X) \rangle \cong \mathbb{F}_q[X] / \langle p(X) \rangle \cong \mathbb{F}_q(\alpha)$$

where $p(\alpha) = 0$. Notice that $S = R[X] / \langle q(X) \rangle$ is a local ring with maximal ideal $\langle M, q(X) \rangle + \langle q(X) \rangle$, that can be seen as a separable extension of R (since $p(X) \in \mathbb{F}_q[X]$ is irreducible). In particular we have that S is a finite local chain ring. If we consider $q(X) \in S[X]$, then the element $A = X + \langle q(X) \rangle \in S$ is a root of the polynomial $q(X)$ that lifts α , and so we can write $S = R(A)$.

Definition 3. Let μ , R , $p_{\mu,i}$ $i = 1, \dots, r$, $w_{\mu,i}$ and $\pi_{\mu,i}$ $i = 2, \dots, r$ be as in Definition 2, then for all $i = 1, \dots, r$ we define $q_{\mu,i}$ as the Hensel's lifting of the polynomial $p_{\mu,i}$ to $R[X_i]$ and, for all $i = 2, \dots, r$, we define $z_{\mu,i}$ and $\sigma_{\mu,i}$ as the Hensel's liftings of the polynomials $w_{\mu,i}, \pi_{\mu,i} \in \mathbb{F}_q(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{i-1})[X_i]$ to $R_{i-1}[X_i]$ where R_{i-1} is the local ring $R(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{i-1})$.

Remark 2. By the discussion above the polynomials $z_{\mu,i}$ and $\sigma_{\mu,i}$ $i = 2, \dots, r$ are well defined. Moreover, as in Remark 1 they can be seen as polynomials in $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]$ (substituting the lifting of the root μ_i by the corresponding indeterminate X_i), and $T = R[X_1, \dots, X_r] / \langle q_{\mu,1}, z_{\mu,2}, \dots, z_{\mu,r} \rangle$ is a local ring with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} = \langle M, q_{\mu,1}, z_{\mu,2}, \dots, z_{\mu,r} \rangle + \langle q_{\mu,1}, z_{\mu,2}, \dots, z_{\mu,r} \rangle$ and quotient ring

$$T/\mathfrak{m} \cong \mathbb{F}_q(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r). \quad (6)$$

Lemma 1. Let R be a finite chain ring with maximal ideal $M = \langle a \rangle$ and residue field $\mathbb{F}_q$ where the nilpotency index of a is t . Let $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r) \in H_1 \times \dots \times H_r$ and consider the ideal

$$I_\mu = \langle q_{\mu,1}, z_{\mu,2}, \dots, z_{\mu,r} \rangle \quad (7)$$

where the polynomials $q_{\mu,1}, z_{\mu,i}$ $i = 2, \dots, r$ are defined as above.

Then $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I_\mu$ is a finite commutative chain ring with maximal ideal $\langle a + I_\mu \rangle$, residue field $\mathbb{F}_q(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r)$ and precisely the following ideals

$$\langle 0 \rangle = \langle a^t + I_\mu \rangle \subsetneq \langle a^{t-1} + I_\mu \rangle \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \langle a^1 + I_\mu \rangle = M \subsetneq \langle a^0 + I_\mu \rangle. \quad (8)$$

Proof. It is a straightforward conclusion of the above discussion and the fact that $M = \langle a \rangle$ $\square$

Definition 4. Let $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r) \in H_1 \times \dots \times H_r$, we define the following polynomial in $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]$

$$h_\mu(X_1, \dots, X_r) = \prod_{i=1}^r \frac{t_i(X_i)}{q_{\mu,i}(X_i)} \prod_{i=2}^r \sigma_{\mu,i}(X_2, \dots, X_r) \quad (9)$$

where the polynomials $t_i, q_{\mu,i}$ $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $\sigma_{\mu,i}$ $i = 2, \dots, r$ are defined as in Definition 3.

Proposition 2. If $I = \langle t_1(X_1), \dots, t_r(X_r) \rangle \triangleleft R[X_1, \dots, X_r]$, then the annihilator of $\langle h_\mu + I \rangle$ in $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I$ is

$$\text{Ann}(\langle h_\mu + I \rangle) = I_\mu + I \quad (10)$$

Proof. Clearly $I_\mu + I \subseteq \text{Ann}(\langle h_\mu + I \rangle)$.

On the other hand, if $g + I \in \text{Ann}(\langle h_\mu + I \rangle)$, then the polynomial $\overline{gh}_\mu \in \bar{I} = \langle \bar{t}_1(X_1), \dots, \bar{t}_r(X_r) \rangle$ and so $\bar{g} + \bar{I} \in \text{Ann}(\langle \bar{h}_\mu + \bar{I} \rangle) = \langle \bar{q}_{\mu,1}, \bar{z}_{\mu,2}, \dots, \bar{z}_{\mu,r} \rangle$ (cf. [16, Proposition 6]). Hence $\bar{g} + I \in \langle I_\mu + \langle a \rangle \rangle + I$ and thus $\text{Ann}(\langle h_\mu + I \rangle) = \langle I_\mu + \langle a^s \rangle \rangle + I$ for some $s \in \{0, \dots, t\}$. Now, if θ_i is a root of $q_{\mu,i}$ $i = 1, \dots, r$ lifting μ_i and we denote $\Theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)$, then $h_\mu(\Theta) \notin \langle a \rangle$ (since $\bar{h}_\mu(\mu) \neq 0$, cf. [16, Chapter 5, Proposition 7]) and therefore we can conclude $\text{Ann}(\langle h_\mu + I \rangle) = I_\mu + I$ as desired (otherwise $s < t$, and so $a^{t-1} = a^s a^{t-1-s} \in \text{Ann}(\langle h_\mu + I \rangle)$ implies $a^{t-1}h_\mu \in I$ and $0 = a^{t-1}h_\mu(\Theta)$, i.e., $h_\mu(\Theta) \in \langle a \rangle$, a contradiction). $\square$

Notice that, if $\mu' \in C(\mu)$, then $q_{\mu,i} = q_{\mu',i}$ $i = 1, \dots, r$, $z_{\mu,i} = z_{\mu',i}$, $\sigma_{\mu,i} = \sigma_{\mu',i}$ $i = 2, \dots, r$ and so $h_\mu = h_{\mu'}$. Therefore, by abuse of notation we shall write I_C and h_C instead of I_μ and h_μ provided that C is the class $C(\mu)$.

Lemma 2. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of classes $C(\mu)$ where $\mu \in H_1 \times \dots \times H_r$, and $C, C' \in \mathcal{C}$. Then:

1. The set of zeros of $\bar{h}_C$ is $H_1 \times \dots \times H_r \setminus C$ and the set of zeros of $\bar{I}_C$ is C .
2. $\langle t_1(X_1), \dots, t_r(X_r) \rangle = \bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{C}} I_C$.
3. $I_C, I_{C'}$ are comaximal if $C \neq C'$.

Proof.

1. Is a direct translation of Proposition 7 in [16, Chapter 5]. Note that the ideal $\bar{I} = \langle \bar{t}_1(X_1), \dots, \bar{t}_r(X_r) \rangle$ is a radical ideal in $\mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_r]$ and the variety

$$V(\langle \bar{t}_1(X_1), \dots, \bar{t}_r(X_r) \rangle) = \bigsqcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} C = V(\bar{I}_C) \quad (11)$$

thus $\langle \bar{t}_1(X_1), \dots, \bar{t}_r(X_r) \rangle = \bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \bar{I}_C$.

2. Clearly $\langle t_1(X_1), \dots, t_r(X_r) \rangle \subseteq \bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{C}} I_C$. Suppose that $f \in \bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{C}} I_C$, then by Proposition 2 we have that $f + I \in \text{Ann}(\langle h_\mu + I \rangle)$ for all choices of μ . Thus $\overline{fh_\mu} \in \bar{I}$ for all μ , and by part 1) of this proof $\bar{f} \in \bar{I}$ and the result follows.
3. Arises from the fact that in equation (11) the union is disjoint.

□

Theorem 2.

$$R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I \cong \bigoplus_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \langle h_C + I \rangle \quad (12)$$

where $\langle h_C + I \rangle \cong R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I_C$ is a finite commutative chain ring with maximal ideal $\langle a + I_C \rangle$.

Proof. By the Chinese Remainder theorem

$$R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I = R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/\bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{C}} I_C \cong \bigoplus_{C \in \mathcal{C}} R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I_C$$

and the result follows. □

Remark 3. The above theorem is equivalent to the fact that there exist primitive orthogonal idempotents elements $e_i \in R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I$ (one for each class $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$) such that $1 = \sum e_i$ and $e_i (R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I) \cong \langle h_{C_i} + I \rangle$ (cf. [2, Proposition 3.1.3]). Namely, the idempotent e_i is exactly the element $g_{C_i} h_{C_i} + I$, where $g_{C_i} h_{C_i} + I_{C_i} = 1 + I_{C_i}$.

3.2 Description of the codes

Classical coding theory has been developed in vector spaces over finite fields, a good background in algebraic codes over finite fields is the textbook [8]. We describe some natural modifications that leads us to codes over finite rings, see for example the textbook [2].

For a finite commutative ring R consider the set R^n of all n -uples as a module over R as usual. We say that a subset $\mathcal{K}$ of R^n is a **linear code** if $\mathcal{K}$ is an R -submodule of R^n . Given an ideal $J \triangleleft R[X_1, \dots, X_r]$ such that the algebra $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/J$ has finite rank n as R -module, and given an ordering on the set of terms, each element of $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/J$ can be identified with a n -uple in R^n .

Given two elements $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n), \mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in R^n$ the scalar product is $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = (x_1 y_1 + \dots + x_n y_n) \in R$. We say that $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ are **orthogonal** if $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = 0$ and, for a linear code $\mathcal{K}$, we define the **dual code** as $\mathcal{K}^\perp = \{\mathbf{x} \in R^n \mid \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{c} = 0 \ \forall \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{K}\}$. The code $\mathcal{K}$ is called **selfdual** if $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^\perp$.

Definition 5 (Multivariable semisimple code). Let $t_i(X_i) \in R[X_i]$ $i = 1, \dots, r$ be polynomials over a finite chain ring R . A **multivariable code** is an ideal $\mathcal{K}$ of the ring $R[X_1, \dots, X_r] / \langle t_1(X_1), \dots, t_r(X_r) \rangle$. If the polynomials t_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, are defined as in the previous section, then we shall say that the code is **semisimple**.

Notice that a multivariable semisimple code is not *semisimple* in the classical ring theoretic sense. Indeed, we shall see later (Corollary 1) that any semisimple code is a sum of finite chain rings. The name is justified so, by the fact that the image code $\overline{\mathcal{K}}$ of $\mathcal{K}$ in $\overline{R}[X_1, \dots, X_r] / \langle \overline{t}_1(X_1), \dots, \overline{t}_r(X_r) \rangle$ is semisimple ($\overline{\mathcal{K}}$ is a sum of simple ideals).

Clearly this class of codes includes, among others, cyclic and negacyclic semisimple codes. Next we present an example of non-trivial codes that fall into this category. This example is due to A.A. Nechaev and A.S. Kuzmin [13].

Example 1. Let $R = GR(q^2, 2^2)$ ($q = 2^l$) be the Galois Ring of cardinality q^2 and characteristic 2^2 [9], and let $S = GR(q^{2m}, 2^2)$ be its Galois extension of odd degree $m \geq 3$. Both R and S are finite commutative chain rings with maximal ideals $2R$ and $2S$ and residue fields $\overline{R} = GF(q)$ and $\overline{S} = GF(q^m)$, respectively. With the help of the Teichmüller Coordinate Set (TCS) $\Gamma(S) = \{a^{q^m} = a \mid a \in S\}$ any element $a \in S$ can be decomposed uniquely as $a = \gamma_0(a) + 2\gamma_1(a)$, where $\gamma_i(a) \in \Gamma(S)$. Moreover, if $\oplus : \Gamma(S) \times \Gamma(S) \rightarrow \Gamma(S)$ is defined as $a \oplus b = \gamma_0(a + b)$, then $(\Gamma(S), \oplus, \cdot)$ is the finite field $GF(q^m)$ whose cyclic multiplicative group is generated by an element θ of order $\tau = q^m - 1$, and the TCS $\Gamma(R) = \{a^q = a \mid a \in R\} = \{w_0 = 0, w_1, \dots, w_{q-1}\}$ is the subfield $GF(q)$. Let $\text{Tr} : S \rightarrow R$ denote the trace function from S onto R , then the (shortened) R -base linear code is given by:

$$\mathcal{L} = \{(\text{Tr}(\xi) + a, \text{Tr}(\xi\theta) + a, \dots, \text{Tr}(\xi\theta^{\tau-1}) + a) \mid \xi \in S, a \in R\}.$$

It is an R -linear code of length τ , cardinality $q^{2(m+1)}$ and the (shortened) *Generalized Kerdock code* is the projection of $\mathcal{L}$ in $\Gamma(R)^{\tau q}$ with the help of τ copies of the RS -map:

$$\gamma_*(a) = (\gamma_1(a), \gamma_1(a) \oplus w_1 \gamma_0(a), \dots, \gamma_1(a) \oplus w_{q-1} \gamma_0(a)) , \ a \in R.$$

It is an $GF(q)$ -nonlinear code of length τq , cardinality $q^{2(m+1)}$ and Hamming distance $\frac{q-1}{q}(n - \sqrt{n}) - q$.

This code can be presented in a polycyclic form with the help of a multivariable code over the finite chain ring R , by the following way. The multiplicative group $U = 1 + 2R = \{u_0 = 1, u_1, \dots, u_{q-1}\}$ is a direct product $\langle \eta_1 \rangle \times \dots \times \langle \eta_l \rangle$ of l subgroups of order 2. Consider the ideal I of $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]$, where $r = l + 1$, generated by the polynomials $t_1(X_1) =$

$X_1^T - 1, t_2(X_2) = X_2^2 - 1, \dots, t_r(X_r) = X_r^2 - 1$. If we denote $\vec{U} = (u_0, \dots, u_{q-1})$ and $\vec{a} \otimes \vec{U} = (a_1 \vec{U}, \dots, a_q \vec{U}) \in R^{q^r}$ for any $\vec{a} \in R^r$, then the multivariable code $\mathcal{K} \triangleleft R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I$ given by

$$\mathcal{K} = \left\{ \sum_{i_1=0}^{\tau-1} \sum_{i_2=0}^1 \cdots \sum_{i_r=0}^1 ((\text{Tr}(\xi \theta^{i_1}) + a) \eta_1^{i_2} \cdots \eta_r^{i_r}) X_1^{i_1} X_2^{i_2} \cdots X_r^{i_r} \mid \xi \in S, a \in R \right\}$$

is equivalent to the code $\mathcal{L} \otimes \vec{U}$, and the shortened Generalized Kerdock code is equivalent to the polycyclic code $\gamma_1^{q^r}(\mathcal{K})$. Notice that this code is not semisimple, though.

Now we can back to the description of multivariable semisimple codes. The following two results are straight forward corollaries of Theorem 2.

Corollary 1. *Let R be a finite chain ring with maximal ideal $\langle a \rangle$ and nilpotency index t . Any semisimple code $\mathcal{K}$ in $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I$ where $I = \langle t_1(X_1), \dots, t_r(X_r) \rangle$, is a sum of ideals of the form*

$$\langle a^{j_C} h_C + I \rangle \quad 0 \leq j_C \leq t, \text{ and } C \in \mathcal{C} \quad (13)$$

Corollary 2. *In the conditions of the previous corollary, there are $(t+1)^N$ semisimple codes in $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I$, where $N = |\mathcal{C}|$.*

We shall now obtain an explicit description of semisimple codes in terms of polynomials of the ring $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]$.

Theorem 3. *If $\mathcal{K}$ is a semisimple code in $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I$, then there exists a family of polynomials $G_0, \dots, G_t \in R[X_1, \dots, X_r]$ determining uniquely the ideals $\langle G_i + I \rangle$ such that*

$$I = \bigcap_{i=0}^t \text{Ann} \langle G_i + I \rangle, \quad \mathcal{K} = \langle G_1, aG_2, \dots, a^{t-1}G_t \rangle + I \quad (14)$$

and, for each pair $0 \leq i < j \leq t$, the ideals $\text{Ann} \langle G_i + I \rangle, \text{Ann} \langle G_j + I \rangle$ are comaximal. Moreover, $\mathcal{K} = \langle G + I \rangle$, where $G = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} a^i G_{i+1}$.

Proof. By Corollary 1 $\mathcal{K}$ is a direct sum of ideals of the form $\langle a^{j_C} h_C + I \rangle$, where $0 \leq j_C \leq t$, and $C \in \mathcal{C}$. If $N = |\mathcal{C}|$ is the number of classes in $\mathcal{C}$, then, after reordering of the classes in $\mathcal{C}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K} &= \langle h_{C_{k_1+1}} + I \rangle \oplus \cdots \oplus \langle h_{C_{k_1+k_2}} + I \rangle \\ &\oplus \langle ah_{C_{k_1+k_2+1}} + I \rangle \oplus \cdots \oplus \langle ah_{C_{k_1+k_2+k_3}} + I \rangle \oplus \cdots \oplus \\ &\langle a^{t-1}h_{C_{\sum_{i=1}^t k_i+1}} + I \rangle \oplus \cdots \oplus \langle a^{t-1}h_{C_N} + I \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where $k_i \geq 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ and $\sum_{i=1}^t k_i + 1 \leq N$. Let $k_0 = 0$ and $k_{t+1} = N - \sum_{i=1}^t k_i$, and define

$$G_i = \sum_{j=k_0+\cdots+k_{i+1}}^{k_0+\cdots+k_{i+1}} g_{C_j} h_{C_j}$$

where $g_{C_j} \in R[X_1, \dots, X_r]$, $j = k_0 + \dots + k_i + 1, \dots, k_0 + \dots + k_{i+1}$, $i = 0, \dots, t$ are the polynomials defining the primitive orthogonal idempotents of Remark 3. Then:

$$\langle G_i + I \rangle = \sum_{j=k_0+\dots+k_i+1}^{k_0+\dots+k_{i+1}} \langle h_{C_j} + I \rangle$$

and so we have $\mathcal{K} = \langle G_1, aG_2, \dots, a^{t-1}G_t \rangle + I$, and

$$\bigcap_{i=0}^t \text{Ann} \langle G_i + I \rangle = \bigcap_{i=0}^t \bigcap_{j=k_0+\dots+k_i+1}^{k_0+\dots+k_{i+1}} \text{Ann} (\langle h_{C_j} + I \rangle) = \bigcap_{k=0}^N I_{C_k} + I.$$

Moreover, for each pair $0 \leq i < j \leq t$, the ideals $\text{Ann} \langle G_i + I \rangle$, $\text{Ann} \langle G_j + I \rangle$ are comaximal, from 2) and 3) in Lemma 2. The uniqueness of the ideals $\langle G_i + I \rangle$, $i = 0, \dots, t$, follows from fact that the decomposition in Theorem 2 is unique, and Corollary 1. Finally, the equality $\mathcal{K} = \langle G + I \rangle$ is satisfied, since each elements G_i is a sum of primitive idempotent orthogonals of the ring. $\square$

With this description in hand we can obtain the cardinality of any semisimple code.

Corollary 3. *In the conditions of Theorem 3 $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I$ is a principal ideal ring and, for any semisimple code $\mathcal{K}$, we have:*

$$|\mathcal{K}| = |\bar{R}|^{\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (t-i)N_i}$$

where N_i denotes the number of zeros $\mu \in H_1 \times \dots \times H_r$ of $\bar{G}_i$, $i = 0, \dots, t-1$.

Proof. For $i = 0, \dots, t-1$ we have

$$\langle a^i G_{i+1} + I \rangle = \left(\frac{|R|}{|\langle a^i \rangle|} \right)^{\text{rank}_R(\langle G_i + I \rangle)} = |\bar{R}|^{(t-i)\text{rank}_R(\langle G_i + I \rangle)}.$$

Since $\text{rank}_R(\langle G_i + I \rangle) = \dim_{\bar{R}} \langle \bar{G}_i + \bar{I} \rangle$, the result follows from [16]. $\square$

3.3 Hamming distance of the codes

For $\mathbf{c} \in R^n$ we denote by $\text{wt}(\mathbf{c})$ the **Hamming weight** of $\mathbf{c}$, that is, the cardinality of $\text{supp}(\mathbf{c}) = \{i \mid c_i \neq 0\}$, the **support** of $\mathbf{c}$. The **minimum distance** of a code $\mathcal{K} \in R^n$, i.e. the minimum Hamming weight of the nonzero elements in $\mathcal{K}$, will be denoted by $d(\mathcal{K})$.

Definition 6. Let R be a local ring with maximal ideal $M = \text{rad}(R)$ and residue field $\mathbb{F}_q = \bar{R}$. The **socle** $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{K})$ of an R -linear code $\mathcal{K}$ is defined as the sum of all its irreducible R -submodules.

Accordingly to [7] the equality

$$\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{K}) = \{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{K} \mid M\mathbf{c} = 0\}$$

holds for any R -linear code $\mathcal{K}$. So we may consider $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{K})$ as a linear space over the field $\mathbb{F}_q$ where $\bar{r} \cdot \mathbf{c} = r\mathbf{c}$ for all $\bar{r} \in \mathbb{F}_q$, $\mathbf{c} \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{K})$.

Lemma 3. Let R be a local ring with maximal ideal M and $\mathcal{K}$ an R -linear code of length n . Then $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{K})$ is a linear code of length n over the field $\mathbb{F}_q = R/M$ and $d(\mathcal{K}) = d(\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{K}))$.

Proof. It is a direct translation of Proposition 5 in [7]. $\square$

Proposition 3. In the conditions of Theorem 3 $d(\mathcal{K}) = d(\mathcal{L})$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is the code $\langle \overline{G_1}, \dots, \overline{G_t} \rangle + \overline{I}$ in $\mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_r]/\langle \overline{t_1}(X_1), \dots, \overline{t_r}(X_r) \rangle$.

Proof. The socle of the code $\mathcal{K}$ is $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{K}) = \langle a^{t-1}G_1, a^{t-1}G_2, \dots, a^{t-1}G_t \rangle + I$, that can be seen as a linear code over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Consider the $\mathbb{F}_q$ -vector space isomorphism $\phi : a^{t-1}R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_r]/\overline{I}$, given by $a^{t-1}g + I \rightarrow \overline{g} + \overline{I}$ to conclude the result. $\square$

In the general situation we can not state that the minimum distance of a semisimple code $\mathcal{K}$ is equal to the minimum distance of the code $\overline{\mathcal{K}}$. The more we can say is that, if $\overline{\mathcal{K}} \neq 0$, then $d(\mathcal{K}) \leq d(\overline{\mathcal{K}})$. However, there is one subclass of multivariable semisimple codes for which the equality holds.

Definition 7. In the conditions of Theorem 3, the code $\mathcal{K}$ is called **Hensel lift of a multivariable semisimple code** if $\langle G_1 + I \rangle \neq I$ and $\langle G_i + I \rangle = 0$, for all $i = 2, \dots, t$.

This notion generalizes the definition of a *Hensel lift of a cyclic code* introduced in [14]. For this class of codes we have the following result.

Corollary 4. If $\mathcal{K} \neq 0$ is a Hensel lift of a multivariable semisimple code, then $d(\mathcal{K}) = d(\overline{\mathcal{K}})$.

Proof. As noticed above the inequality $d(\mathcal{K}) \leq d(\overline{\mathcal{K}})$ holds. On the other hand, since $\mathcal{K}$ is a Hensel lift of a multivariable semisimple code, we have that $\mathcal{L} = \overline{\mathcal{K}}$ and the result follows from the previous proposition. $\square$

This corollary generalizes Corollary 4.3 in [14] for Hensel lift of cyclic codes. Moreover, all classical bounds on distances for semisimple codes over fields (BCH, Hartmann-Tzeng, Roos, ...) also apply to their Hensel lifts. Remark that these bounds can be stated in the multivariable abelian case due to Proposition 8 in [16][Chapitre 6], that we remind in Proposition 4 below.

Definition 8. A multivariable semisimple code $\mathcal{K} \triangleleft R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I$ is called **abelian**, if $I = \langle x_1^{e_1} - 1, \dots, X_r^{e_r} - 1 \rangle$, where $e_1, \dots, e_r \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $S = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^l \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{s_i} C(\mu^{(i,j)})$ be the set of defining roots of a semisimple abelian code in $\mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_r]/\overline{I}$, where $C(\mu^{(i,j)}) \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $p_{\mu^{(i,j)},1} = p_{\mu^{(k,l)},1}$ iff $i = k$. Consider for each class $C(\mu^{(i,j)})$ the polynomial:

$$\frac{\overline{t_1}(X_1)}{p_{\mu^{(i,j)},1}(X_1)} \quad \left(\prod_{k=2}^r \frac{\overline{t_k}(X_k)}{p_{\mu^{(i,j)},k}(X_k)} \prod_{k=2}^r \pi_{\mu^{(i,j)},k}(X_2, \dots, X_r) \right) = \frac{\overline{t_1}(X_1)}{p_{\mu^{(i,j)},1}(X_1)} (F_{ij}(X_2, \dots, X_r))$$

Here $p_{\mu^{(i,j)},k}$ $k = 1, \dots, r$, and $\pi_{\mu^{(i,j)},k}$ $k = 2, \dots, r$ are as in Definition 2, and $F_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_2, \dots, X_r]$ is uniquely determined by the class $C(\mu^{(i,j)})$. Let us consider the field $\mathbb{F}^{(i)} = \mathbb{F}_q(X_1)/p_{\mu^{(i,1)},1}(X_1)$, and the code J_i generated by $\sum_{j=1}^{s_i} F_{ij}$ in the algebra $\mathbb{F}^{(i)}[X_2, \dots, X_r]/\langle \bar{t}_2, \dots, \bar{t}_r \rangle$, $i = 1, \dots, l$.

Proposition 4. *With the notations above, the minimum weight of a semisimple code over a field $\mathbb{F}_q$ and of the corresponding Hensel lift over R is at least $\min_{1 \leq i \leq l} \{d_i \cdot \delta_i\}$ where d_i is the minimum weight of the code in $\mathbb{F}_q[X_1]/\bar{t}(X_1)$ generated by*

$$\frac{\bar{t}(X_1)}{p_{\mu^{(i,1)},1}(X_1) \cdot \dots \cdot p_{\mu^{(l,1)},1}(X_1)}$$

and δ_i is the minimum weight of the code J_i .

Proof. It is a straight forward generalization of Lemma 3 and Proposition 8 in [16][Chapitre 6]. $\square$

Remark 4. Notice that, in view of this result, the computation of the minimum distance of a semisimple abelian code in r variables is reduced to computations of minimum distances of semisimple abelian codes in less number of variables.

4 Dual codes of abelian semisimple codes

In this section we describe the dual codes of abelian multivariable semisimple codes. Notice that any defining ideal I of abelian codes must satisfy the following property: $(e_i, p) = 1$, for all $i = 1, \dots, r$, since the code is semisimple. On the other hand, any semisimple abelian code can be seen also as a **group code**, i.e., as an ideal of a certain group ring. Namely, the group ring $RG = R(\mathbb{C}_{e_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{C}_{e_r})$, where $\mathbb{C}_s$ is the cyclic group of order s .

Definition 9. Let $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I$ be a semisimple abelian code with $I = \langle x_1^{e_1} - 1, \dots, X_r^{e_r} - 1 \rangle$, then we define the ring automorphism τ of $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I$ given by $\tau(f(X_1, \dots, X_r)) = f(X_1^{-1}, \dots, X_r^{-1}) = f(X_1^{e_1-1}, \dots, X_r^{e_r-1})$. It is clear that this automorphism preserves the Hamming weights of a words.

Theorem 4. *If $\mathcal{K} = \langle G_1, aG_2, \dots, a^{t-1}G_t \rangle + I$ is a semisimple abelian code in the conditions of Theorem 3, then its dual code is*

$$\mathcal{K}^\perp = \langle \tau(G_0), a\tau(G_t), \dots, a^{t-1}\tau(G_2) \rangle + I,$$

where the polynomials $\tau(G_i)$, $i = 0, 2, 3, \dots, t$ are also in the conditions of Theorem 3.

Proof. Let us first prove that $\mathcal{K}^\perp = \tau(\text{Ann}(\mathcal{K}))$. For all $F + I \in R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I$ we have that $F + I \in \tau(\text{Ann}(\mathcal{K}))$ if, and only if, for all $Q + I \in \mathcal{K}$:

$$I = Q\tau(F) + I$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_r} q_{i_1, \dots, i_r} X_1^{i_1} \dots X_r^{i_r} \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_r} f_{j_1, \dots, j_r} X_1^{e_1-j_1} \dots X_r^{e_r-j_r} + I \\
&= \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_r} \left(\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_r} q_{i_1, \dots, i_r} f_{i_1-k_1 \pmod{e_1}, \dots, i_r-k_r \pmod{e_r}} \right) X_1^{k_1} \dots X_r^{k_r} + I \\
&= \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_r} (\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_r}) X_1^{k_1} \dots X_r^{k_r} + I,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_r}$ denote, respectively, the vector of coefficients of Q and $X_1^{k_1} \dots X_r^{k_r} F$, in a fixed ordering of the terms in $R[X_1, \dots, X_r]/I$. Hence, $F + I \in \tau(\text{Ann}(\mathcal{K}))$ if, and only if, for all $Q + I \in \mathcal{K}$ and for all $0 \leq k_1 < e_1, \dots, 1 \leq k_r < e_r$, $\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_r} = 0$, i.e., $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_r} \cdot \mathbf{f} = 0$, where $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_r}$ denotes the vector of coefficients of $X_1^{-k_1} \dots X_r^{-k_r} Q$, that is if, and only if, $F + I \in \mathcal{K}^\perp$.

Notice that the polynomials $\tau(G_i)$, $i = 0, \dots, t$ are in the conditions of Theorem 3, and so it is enough to see that $a^i G_{t+1-i} + I \in \text{Ann}(\mathcal{K})$, $i = 0, \dots, t-1$, to conclude the result (here we denote $G_{t+1} = G_0$). Let $i, j = 0, \dots, t-1$, if $i + j \geq t$, then $(a^i G_{t+1-i} + I)(a^j G_{j+1} + I) = a^{i+j} (G_{t+1-i} G_{j+1}) + I = I$ and, if $i + j < t$, then $\langle G_{t+1-i} + I \rangle \neq \langle G_{j+1} + I \rangle$, and so $(a^i G_{t+1-i} + I)(a^j G_{j+1}) = I$, from the decomposition of $\mathcal{K}$ in Theorem 3. $\square$

Corollary 5. *In the conditions of the previous theorem:*

$$|\mathcal{K}^\perp| = |\bar{R}|^{\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} i N_i}$$

where N_i is the number of zeros $\mu \in H_1 \times \dots \times H_r$ of $\bar{G}_i$, $i = 0, \dots, t-1$, and $\mathcal{K}^\perp = \langle \tau(G_0) + a\tau(G_t) + \dots + a^{t-1}\tau(G_2) + I \rangle$

Proof. The result follows from [5, Proposition 2.11] and the fact that the polynomials $\tau(G_i)$ are in the conditions of Theorem 3. $\square$

Remark 5. In view of Theorem 4 all the remarks concerning the distance of a code observed in the previous section can be applied also to its dual. Of course, the results about the minimum distance of a code and the minimum distance of its dual involving the MacWilliams identity for codes over Quasi-Frobenius modules [7] apply also in our case. In sake of brevity we will not get into details, though.

5 Self-dual abelian semisimple codes

In the previous section we have described explicitly the dual code of a given abelian semisimple code $\mathcal{K}$. We want now to study conditions on $\mathcal{K}$ to be self-dual. Notice first that, if the nilpotency index t of a is even, then there always exists a self-dual code, namely $\langle a^{\frac{t}{2}} \rangle$, that it is called the **trivial self-dual code**. On the other hand, remember that any abelian code is also a group code and so the problem of existence of self-dual semisimple abelian codes can be

reduced to the existence of self-dual group codes in RG . This problem has been solved for some classes of rings R . In this direction an interesting work is [17] where the existence of self-dual codes is characterized when R is a Galois Ring. The techniques of proof make use of Group Representation Theory and can be also used when R is a finite commutative chain ring. Namely, the following result holds.

Theorem 5. *Let R be a finite chain commutative ring of characteristic p with $a \in R$ such that $\langle a \rangle = \text{rad}(R)$ with nilpotency index t , and let G be a finite group. Then RG contains a self-dual group code (that is, an ideal $\mathcal{K} \triangleleft RG$ such that $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = 0$, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{K}$) if, and only if, p is odd and t even, or p and $t|G|$ are even.*

Proof. The proof is exactly the same that in the case of R being a Galois Ring (see [17]). This is due to the following two facts: any finite commutative chain ring R is a Frobenius ring [18], and for any finite group G we have a filtration

$$0 \subsetneq a^{t-1}RG \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq a^1RG \subsetneq RG.$$

□

In view of this result we can only expect to find non-trivial self-dual codes in the semisimple abelian case if, and only if, p and $|G|$ are even, or t is even. The first case is clearly impossible, since $|G| = \prod_{i=1}^r e_i$ even implies that there exists some e_i even and the code is not semisimple (notice that $p = 2$). So we have only to study the case when t is an even number. As a consequence to Theorem 4 we have the following result.

Corollary 6. *Let $\mathcal{K} = \langle G_1, aG_2, \dots, a^{t-1}G_t \rangle + I$ be a semisimple abelian code in the conditions of Theorem 3, then $\mathcal{K}$ is self-dual if, and only if, $\langle G_i + I \rangle = \langle \tau(G_j) + I \rangle$ when $i + j \equiv 1 \pmod{t+1}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 4 we have $\mathcal{K}^\perp = \langle \tau(G_0), a\tau(G_t), \dots, a^{t-1}\tau(G_2) \rangle + I$. Therefore, if $\langle G_i + I \rangle = \langle \tau(G_j) + I \rangle$ where $i + j \equiv 1 \pmod{t+1}$, then $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^\perp$, and the code is self-dual. Conversely, if $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^\perp$, then $\langle G_1, aG_2, \dots, a^{t-1}G_t \rangle + I = \langle \tau(G_0), a\tau(G_t), \dots, a^{t-1}\tau(G_2) \rangle + I$, and the result follows from the uniqueness of the ideals in Theorem 3. □

Theorem 6. *If t is an even number, then there exist non-trivial self-dual semisimple abelian codes if, and only if, there exists $\mu \in H_1 \times \cdots \times H_r$ such that $C(\mu) \neq C(\mu^{-1})$, where $\mu^{-1} = (\mu_1^{-1}, \dots, \mu_r^{-1})$.*

Proof. Let us first assume that there exists $\mu \in H_1 \times \cdots \times H_r$ such that $C(\mu) \neq C(\mu^{-1})$. Let $G + I$ be a generator of the semisimple abelian code $\bigoplus_{\eta \neq \mu, \mu^{-1}} \langle h_\eta + I \rangle$ and consider:

$$\mathcal{K} = \left\langle a^{\frac{t}{2}-1}h_\mu, a^{\frac{t}{2}}G, a^{\frac{t}{2}+1}h_{\mu^{-1}} \right\rangle + I.$$

Since $\langle \tau(h_{\mu^{-1}}) + I \rangle = \langle h_{\mu} + I \rangle$ and $\langle \tau(G) + I \rangle = \langle G + I \rangle$ we have, from the previous corollary, that $\mathcal{K}$ is a non-trivial self-dual semisimple abelian code.

Conversely, if $\mathcal{K} = \langle G_1, aG_2, \dots, a^{t-1}G_t \rangle + I$ is a self-dual semisimple code, then for all i, j such that $i + j \equiv 1 \pmod{t+1}$ we have that $\langle G_i + I \rangle = \langle \tau(G_j) + I \rangle$. Assume now that $C(\mu) = C(\mu^{-1})$, for any $\mu \in H_1 \times \dots \times H_r$. Then $\langle h_{\mu} + I \rangle = \langle h_{\mu^{-1}} + I \rangle = \langle \tau(h_{\mu}) + I \rangle$, and so $\langle G_j + I \rangle = \langle \tau(G_j) + I \rangle = \langle G_i + I \rangle$, for all i, j such that $i + j \equiv 1 \pmod{t+1}$. From the decomposition of Theorem 3 we obtain that $\mathcal{K} = \langle a^{\frac{t}{2}} + I \rangle$ is the trivial self-dual code. $\square$

The existence of non-trivial self-dual codes can be eventually reduced to a number theoretical problem, as the following result shows.

Corollary 7. *If t is an even number, then there exist non-trivial self-dual semisimple abelian codes if, and only if, $q^i \not\equiv -1 \pmod{\text{lcm}(e_1, \dots, e_r)}$, for all natural number i .*

Proof. From the previous theorem we have that non-trivial self-dual codes semisimple abelian codes do not exist if, and only if, $C(\mu) = C(\mu^{-1})$, for all $\mu \in H_1 \times \dots \times H_r$. If ξ_i denotes an e_i -th primitive root of unity, then this is equivalent to the condition for all $0 \leq a_i < e_i$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, there exists a natural number h such that $\xi_i^{-a_i} = \xi_i^{q^h a_i}$, i.e., $q^h a_i \equiv -a_i \pmod{e_i}$. Therefore non-trivial self-dual codes do not exist if, and only if, there exists a natural number h such that $q^h \equiv -1 \pmod{e_i}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, r$, that is, $q^i \equiv -1 \pmod{\text{lcm}(e_1, \dots, e_r)}$. $\square$

This result generalizes 4.4 Theorem in [5] for the case of self-dual cyclic codes. In this work it is also included a discussion about pairs of natural numbers (q, n) for which $q^i \not\equiv -1 \pmod{n}$, for all natural numbers i , when q is a prime number. The search of conditions for a pair of numbers to satisfy this property when q is a power of a prime number is an open problem.

References

- [1] S. D. Berman. On the theory of group codes. *Cybernetics*, 3(1):25–31 (1969), 1969.
- [2] G. Bini and F. Flamini. *Finite commutative rings and their applications*. The Kluwer International Series in Engineering and Computer Science, 680. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, MA, 2002.
- [3] A. R. Calderbank, A. R. Hammons, Jr., P. V. Kumar, N. J. A. Sloane, and P. Solé. A linear construction for certain Kerdock and Preparata codes. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 29(2):218–222, 1993.
- [4] P. Charpin. Une généralisation de la construction de Berman des codes de Reed et Muller p -aires. *Comm. Algebra*, 16(11):2231–2246, 1988.

- [5] H. Q. Dinh and S. R. López-Permouth. Cyclic and negacyclic codes over finite chain rings. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 50(8):1728–1744, 2004.
- [6] A. R. Hammons, Jr., P. V. Kumar, A. R. Calderbank, N. J. A. Sloane, and P. Solé. The $\mathbf{Z}_4$ -linearity of Kerdock, Preparata, Goethals, and related codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 40(2):301–319, 1994.
- [7] V. L. Kurakin, A. S. Kuzmin, V. T. Markov, A. V. Mikhalev, and A. A. Nechaev. Linear codes and polylinear recurrences over finite rings and modules (a survey). In *Applied algebra, algebraic algorithms and error-correcting codes (Honolulu, HI, 1999)*, volume 1719 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 365–391. Springer, Berlin, 1999.
- [8] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane. *The theory of error-correcting codes*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1977.
- [9] B. R. McDonald. *Finite rings with identity*. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1974.
- [10] A. A. Nechaev. Trace function in galois ring and noise stable codes. In *V All-Union Symp. on Theory of Rings, Algebras and Modules. Novosibirsk.*, page 97, 1982. (In Russian).
- [11] A. A. Nechaev. Kerdock’s code in cyclic form. *Diskret. Mat.*, 1(4):123–139, 1989.
- [12] A. A. Nechaev and A. S. Kuzmin. Linearly presentable codes. In *Proceedings of the 1996 IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory and Appl., Victoria B.C., Canada.*, pages 31–34, 1996.
- [13] A. A. Nechaev and A. S. Kuzmin. Formal duality of linearly presentable codes over a Galois field. In *Applied algebra, algebraic algorithms and error-correcting codes (Toulouse, 1997)*, volume 1255 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 263–276. Springer, Berlin, 1997.
- [14] G. H. Norton and A. Sălăgean. On the Hamming distance of linear codes over a finite chain ring. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 46(3):1060–1067, 2000.
- [15] A. Poli. Important algebraic calculations for n -variables polynomial codes. *Discrete Math.*, 56(2-3):255–263, 1985.
- [16] A. Poli and L. Huguet. *Codes correcteurs: Théorie et applications*. Masson, Paris, 1988.
- [17] W. Willems. A note on self-dual group codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 48(12):3107–3109, 2002.
- [18] J. A. Wood. Duality for modules over finite rings and applications to coding theory. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 121:555–575, 1999.